

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
Atty. Docket No.: Q62837
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/788,672

REMARKS

Claims 23-41 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 23, 31, 39, and 40 to further clarify the invention. The proposed amendments are clearly supported throughout the specification *e.g.*, page 9, lines 24 to 30 of the specification. In addition, Applicant adds claim 41, which is also supported throughout the specification.

I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 23-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 and Statement of Substance of Interview

Claims 23, 24, 26, 28, 31, 32, 34, 36, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,684,934 to Chen (hereinafter “Chen”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,056,018 to Ikoma (hereinafter “Ikoma”) and U.S. Patent No. 5,924,802 to Sakurai (hereinafter “Sakurai”). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection in view of the following comment.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous telephonic interview on December 4, 2006. An Examiner’s Interview Summary Record (PTO-413) was mailed to the Applicant’s Representatives on December 6, 2006. The PTO-413 requires the Applicant to file a Statement of Substance of the Interview. The Statement of Substance of the Interview is as follows:

During the interview independent claim 23 was discussed in view Chen, Ikoma, and Sakurai. Specifically, Applicant’s representatives argued that Chen fails to disclose or suggest clearing data when the cable is unplugged and when the error occurs after the transmission of

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
Atty. Docket No.: Q62837
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/788,672

data. The Examiner, however, argued that the combination of Chen and Ikoma discloses these unique features set forth in claim 23. Specifically, the Examiner contended when these references are viewed in combination, one of ordinary skill in the art would have achieved a detector that would simply detect whether the cable is unplugged and a clearer that would only clear data when the print transmission has started. The Examiner did agree, however, that further clarifying that the detector of claim 23 detects that the print cable is unplugged regardless of whether a transmission of printing data is started should overcome the rejection of record subject to further search and consideration.

Accordingly, independent claims 23 and 31, as now amended, *inter alia*, recite: “a detector configured to detect that a printer cable is unplugged regardless of whether a transmission of printing data has started, where the printer cable is adapted to connect to a computer.”

If one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined these three references (Chen, Ikoma, and Sakurai), then the detector of Chen would detect the unplugged cable (as disclosed in Ikoma) only during data transmission. In other words, the proposed combination fails to disclose or suggest detecting that a print cable is unplugged regardless of whether the transmission of printing data is started. On the other hand, if Chen’s detector is replaced with the detector of Ikoma, then data buffer will be cleared regardless of whether transmission of data is started because in Chen, the clearer clears data when error from the detector is received. In short, Chen, Ikoma, and Sakurai, taken alone or in any conceivable combination, fails to disclose or suggest independent claims 23 and 31. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 23 and

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Atty. Docket No.: Q62837

U.S. Appln. No.: 09/788,672

31 are patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 24, 26, 28, 32, 34, 36, 39, and 40 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 23 or 31.

In addition, during the telephonic interview, Applicant's Representatives argued that the combined disclosure of Chen, Ikoma, and Sakurai do not disclose or suggest clearing data that is downstream of the detector when the detector detects an error. Chen only discloses that the printstream which is upstream of the error point is cleared and Ikoma and Sakurai disclose that the detector is provided at an upstream side of the data buffer but do not disclose or suggest clearing data at the downstream of the detector. The Examiner noted that the features being argued are not positively set forth in the claims and that further search and consideration is needed when the features being argued are clearly set forth in the claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent claims 39 and 40, in some variation, recite: "the detector is spatially positioned in an upstream direction of the data buffer and wherein the printing data in the data buffer, where said printing data is downstream from the detector, is cleared by the clearer." Accordingly, for at least these additional exemplary reasons, claims 39 and 40 are patentable over Chen in view of Ikoma and Sakurai.

Claims 25 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ikoma, Sakurai, and U.S. Patent No. 5,413,419 to Oami (hereinafter "Oami"), claims 27 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ikoma, Sakurai, and U.S. Patent No. 4,404,433 to Wheeler (hereinafter "Wheeler"), claims 29 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ikoma, Sakurai, and U.S. Patent No. 6,665,082 B1 (hereinafter "Takeoka"), and claims 30 and 38 are rejected

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
Atty. Docket No.: Q62837
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/788,672

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen in view of Ikoma, Sakurai, and U.S. Patent No. 5,978,921 to Ryu (hereinafter “Ryu”). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 depend on claim 23 or 31. It was already demonstrated that Chen in view of Ikoma and Sakurai do not disclose or suggest the unique features of claims 23 and 31. Oami, Wheeler, Takeoka, and Ryu do not cure the deficient disclosure of Chen, Ikoma, and Sakurai. Accordingly, claims 25, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 37, and 38 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 23 or 31.

IV. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claim 41. Claim 41 is patentable at least by virtue of its recitation of “a referrer configured to refer to an information based on the VBUS line regardless of whether a transmission of printing data has started, wherein the referrer judges that the data line upstream of the data buffer is unplugged from the computer based on the information.”

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. **If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and
STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW
Atty. Docket No.: Q62837
U.S. Appln. No.: 09/788,672

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

Date: December 27, 2006